International Journal of Quantum Information
© World Scientific Publishing Company

arXiv:1404.6176v1 [quant-ph] 24 Apr 2014

MULTIPARTITE ENTANGLEMENT AND FEW-BODY HAMILTONIANS

FRANCESCO V. PEPE

Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Bari and INFN - Sezione di Bari, Via Amendola 173 Bari, 70126, Italy
francesco.pepe@ba.infn.it

Received Day Month Year
Revised Day Month Year

We investigate the possibility to obtain higly multipartite-entangled states as *nondegenerate* eigenstates of Hamiltonians that involve only short-range and few-body interactions. We study small-size systems (with a number of qubits ranging from three to five) and search for Hamiltonians with a Maximally Multipartite Entangled State (MMES) as a nondegenerate eigenstate. We then find conditions, including bounds on the number of coupled qubits, to build a Hamiltonian with a Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) state as a nondegenerate eigenstate. We finally comment on possible applications.

Keywords: Multipartite entanglement; complexity; local Hamiltonians.

1. Introduction

Multipartite entanglement is an inherently quantum phenomenon whose features are attracting increasing attention lately. While in the bipartite case different mathematical definitions are physically equivalent,[1,2,3] a unique characterization of multipartite quantum correlations does not exist. Alternative proposals, highlighting different aspects of this phenomenon are possible.[4,5,6,7,8,9] Moreover, multipartite entanglement is characterized by features appearing also in other areas of physics, such as complexity and frustration.[10,11,12,13] The interest in multipartite entanglement has been motivated by possible applications in quantum enhanced tasks,[14] but also by genuine foundational aspects.

It was proposed by P. Facchi *et al.* in Ref. 15 that the multipartite entanglement of a system of qubits can be characterized in terms of the distribution of bipartite entanglement, quantified by a proper measure (e.g. purity), over all possible bipartitions of the system. This leads to the notion of "maximally multipartite entangled states" (MMES), as those states for which average purity over all *balanced* bipartitions is minimal. Another paradigmatic example of multipartite-entangled states are the n-qubit Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger states (GHZ),[16] whose quantum correlations are purely n-partite,[17,4] in the sense that they do not retain any entanglement as one traces out one of the qubits.

By their very definition, highly multipartite-entangled states exhibit nonlocal correlations which are both strong and *distributed* among different bipartitions. This naturally leads to the following question: can MMES or GHZ be obtained as nondegenerate ground states of Hamiltonians that only involve *local* interactions?[18,19,20,21] In the context of spin systems, "local" means both few-body and nearest-neighbor. If this were impossible, one could soften the requirement and ask whether one can find Hamiltonians containing up to two-body interaction terms, whose (nondegenerate) eigenstate is a MMES or GHZ state. These problems were tackled in Refs. 22 and 23. While the answer to the ground-state question is negative, it is instead possible to find local Hamiltonians with multipartite-entangled nondegenerate eigenstates. In this paper, we will analyze the features of Hamiltonians with MMES eigenstates for the cases $n = 3, 4$ and 5 qubits and of a family of Hamiltonians characterized by a GHZ eigenstate for any number of qubits.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we briefly outline the entanglement features of MMES and GHZ states, highlighting analogies and differences. In Section 3 we outline the problems which arise in finding a multipartite-entangled eigenstate of a local Hamiltonian, verify the impossibility to have a nondegenerate MMES or GHZ ground state and study a simple and relevant counterexample, involving W states. In Section 4, two-body and nearest-neighbor Hamiltonians with nondegenerate MMES eigenstate in the cases of $n = 3, 4, 5$ qubits are analyzed, while in Section 5 a set of Hamiltonians which are "as local as possible" and have a GHZ nondegenerate eigenstate is studied. We conclude by discussing possible applications and uses of this kind of operators to generate entanglement.

2. Multipartite entanglement: MMES and GHZ states

Maximally Multipartite Entangled States have been defined in Ref. 15, following the idea that multipartite entanglement is strong if *bipartite* correlations are large and very well-distributed among all different bipartitions. Let us consider a system of n qubits in a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ and an arbitrary bipartition in two subsystems $(A, \bar{A})$, including respectively n_A and $n_{\bar{A}}$ qubits, with $n_A + n_{\bar{A}} = n$ and $n_A \leq n_{\bar{A}}$. Bipartite entanglement between A and $\bar{A}$ can be quantified by purity

$$\pi_A(|\psi\rangle) = \mathrm{Tr}_A\left(\rho_A^2\right), \quad \text{with} \quad \rho_A = \mathrm{Tr}_{\bar{A}}\left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\right). \tag{1}$$

Here, ρ_A is the reduced density matrix of subsystem A and Tr_A ($\mathrm{Tr}_{\bar{A}}$) denotes the trace over the Hilbert space of subsystem A ($\bar{A}$). Purity is bound in the interval

$$\frac{1}{2^{n_A}} \leq \pi_A(|\psi\rangle) \leq 1. \tag{2}$$

The maximum is attained by states which are factorized with respect to the given bipartition. On the other side, maximally entangled states, whose reduced density matrix ρ_A is maximally mixed with respect to the bipartition, saturate the minimum of purity.

Multipartite entanglement can be described in terms of the *distribution of purity over all possible bipartitions* of the system. Clearly, the number of functions one needs for a complete characterization of multipartite quantum correlations scales exponentially with the size of the system. The simplest quantity which can be used to characterize multipartite entanglement is an average value of purity. In Ref. 15 the *potential of multipartite entanglement*, defined as the mean purity over all *balanced* bipartitions with $n_A = [n/2]$, was introduced. It can be expressed as[15,24]

$$\pi_{\mathrm{ME}}(|\psi\rangle) = \frac{1}{C^n_{n_A}} \sum_{n_A=[n/2]} \pi_A(|\psi\rangle), \tag{3}$$

where $C^n_{n_A}$ is the binomial coefficient and the sum runs over all balanced bipartitions. The potential of multipartite entanglement inherits the bound (2):

$$\frac{1}{2^{[n/2]}} \leq \pi_{\mathrm{ME}}(|\psi\rangle) \leq 1. \tag{4}$$

The maximum is attained by states which are *completely factorized*, with every qubit in a pure state, while the lower bound can be saturated only if a state $|\psi\rangle$ is maximally entangled with respect to *all* possible bipartitions of the system. MMES are generally defined as the minimizers of the function π_{ME} for a system of n qubits. Actually, the lower bound $2^{-[n/2]}$ is attained only for a very small set of qubit numbers, namely $n = 3, 5, 6$ (the case $n = 2$ is trivial.) In these cases, minimizers are called *perfect* MMES. In particular, in the case $n = 4$, there exists numerical and analytical evidence[25,26,15,27] that the minimal potential of multipartite entanglement is $\pi_{\mathrm{ME}} = 1/3 > 1/4$.

It is clear by their definition that no unique expression for MMES states exists, and their form should be obtained by analytical and/or numerical minimization of π_{ME}. This aspects will be reflected in a lack of homogeneity in the form of the Hamiltonians with MMES eigenstates, which have few common features as the number of qubit varies and can also include unusual interaction terms.

MMES for $n = 3$ are equivalent by single-qubit unitary transformations to the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) state

$$|G^3_+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|000\rangle + |111\rangle\right). \tag{5}$$

This definition can be generalized in a straightforward way to an arbitrary number of qubits:

$$|G^n_\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|0\rangle^{\otimes n} \pm |1\rangle^{\otimes n}\right) \tag{6}$$

where $\sigma^z|i\rangle = (-1)^i|i\rangle$ defines the computational basis, with $i = 0, 1$ and σ^z the third Pauli matrix. GHZ states represent a generalization of Bell states.[16] Their entanglement features, as well as their definition, are very homogeneous as n varies. Since the purity of a maximally unbalanced bipartition ($n_A = 1$) is always one half, each qubit is maximally entangled to the rest of the chain. However, $\pi_A = 1/2$

for all bipartitions of the system, including the balanced ones. This means that for $n > 3$, GHZ states are far from being minimizers of the potential of multipartite entanglement. Another general feature of GHZ states is that if one of the qubits (say qubit 1 for definiteness) is traced out, the reduced density matrix is unentangled:

$$\rho_{\{2,3,\dots,n\}} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\{1\}}\left(|G^n_\pm\rangle\langle G^n_\pm|\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(|0_2\dots 0_n\rangle\langle 0_2\dots 0_n| + |1_2\dots 1_n\rangle\langle 1_2\dots 1_n|\right).$$

As we shall see in the following discussion, this aspect is closely related to the difficulty of obtaining nondegenerate GHZ eigenstates.

3. The ground state problem

In order to understand where the difficulty of finding a Hamiltonian with an entangled nondegenerate ground state lies, let us consider an n-qubit state $|\psi_n\rangle$ and let us denote with $H_2^{(n)}$ a local Hamiltonian acting on the n-qubit Hilbert space.

It is not difficult to build a generic Hamiltonian characterized by $|\psi_n\rangle$ as the nondegenerate ground state, the simplest example being

$$H = -|\psi_n\rangle\langle\psi_n|. \tag{7}$$

However, the projector appearing in (7) generally contains up to n-body operators, which make the resulting Hamiltonian nonlocal. In order to obtain a local Hamiltonian $H_2^{(n)}$, one should for example add to (7) suitable Hermitian terms which cancel the nonlocal parts in the projector and preserve at the same time the eigenstate property of $|\psi_n\rangle$. This task is easy for states in which no quantum correlation between qubits is present: the factorized state $|1\rangle^{\otimes n}$ is the ground state of the one-body Hamiltonian $\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^z$. When entangled states are taken into account, problems arise because the two-body matrix elements of $H_2^{(n)}$ do not capture all the correlations of the state $|\psi_n\rangle$, which can be complex and encoded in higher-order correlation functions.

We can analyze how incomplete information on a state included in the reduced density matrices affects the ground-state problem. For general theorems on the topic, see Refs. 10, 28, 29. Let us consider a local Hamiltonian $H_2^{(n)}$ and its ground state energy

$$E_0 = \min \mathrm{spec}\left(H_2^{(n)}\right), \tag{8}$$

with $\mathrm{spec}(O)$ denoting the spectrum of operator O. Let us assume that the state $|\psi_n\rangle$ is a ground state, and that there exists another state $|\phi_n\rangle$ which is linearly independent of $|\psi_n\rangle$ and is characterized by the same two-body reduced density matrices. Since the expectation values of $H_2^{(n)}$ on a state are completely determined by two-body reduced density matrices, it follows that

$$\langle\phi_n|H_2^{(n)}|\phi_n\rangle = \langle\psi_n|H_2^{(n)}|\psi_n\rangle = E_0. \tag{9}$$

Being E_0 the lowest energy level, the above result implies that $|\psi_n\rangle$ is also an eigenstate, and thus the ground state is (at least) two-fold degenerate.

In a system of $n = 3$ qubits, for example, the MMES state (5) has the same reduced density matrices, as

$$|G^3_-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|000\rangle - |111\rangle\right). \tag{10}$$

Thus, if one of the states $|G^3_\pm\rangle$ is a ground state of a local Hamiltonian, it must be at least twofold degenerate. In Section 3 we shall find that the degeneracy of a MMES ground state increases with n, as well as the number of states which are orthogonal to the MMES we are taking into account, but share the same two-body reduced density matrices. The GHZ case is even worse, since all the k-body reduced density matrices (with $k < n$) of the states $|G^n_\pm\rangle$ in Eq. (6) coincide. A Hamiltonian can have a nondegenerate GHZ ground state *only if* it involves n-body couplings. As we shall see in the following section, the increasing number of orthogonal states sharing the same expectation values accounts also for a greater difficulty for a MMES to be one of the lowest excited states.

3.1. *A counterexample: W states*

In this subsection we shall show how the problems in finding a MMES or GHZ ground state of a local Hamiltonian do not arise in the case of W states. These are defined[17] as superpositions of computational basis states with all but one spin aligned to the z axis:

$$|W_n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left(|0_1 0_2 \ldots 0_{n-1} 1_n\rangle + |0_1 0_2 \ldots 1_{n-1} 0_n\rangle + \ldots |1_1 0_2 \ldots 0_{n-1} 0_n\rangle\right). \tag{11}$$

Though W states are entangled with respect to all bipartitions like MMES and GHZ states, information on their quantum correlations is fully encoded in their two-body reduced density matrices[4,30]. This is reflected in the possibility of finding n-qubit Hamiltonians with $|W_n\rangle$ ground states in some range of parameters.

An example is given by the class of local XX Hamiltonians with an external field

$$H(b) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\sigma_i^x\sigma_{i+1}^x + \sigma_i^y\sigma_{i+1}^y\right) + b\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sigma_i^z, \tag{12}$$

with $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{n+1} \equiv \boldsymbol{\sigma}_1$, made up of a ferromagnetic Heisenberg coupling in the xy plane and an interaction with an external field b along the orthogonal z axis. It is possible to check that $|W_n\rangle$ is an eigenstate of (12) for all n and all values of b, with eigenvalue

$$\langle W_n|H(b)|W_n\rangle = -4 + b(n-2), \tag{13}$$

since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\sigma_i^x\sigma_{i+1}^x + \sigma_i^y\sigma_{i+1}^y\right)|W_n\rangle = 2\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\sigma_i^+\sigma_{i+1}^- + \sigma_i^-\sigma_{i+1}^+\right)|W_n\rangle = 4|W_n\rangle \tag{14}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i^z |W_n\rangle = [(n-1)-1]\,|W_n\rangle = (n-2)|W_n\rangle. \tag{15}$$

The Hamiltonian can be analytically diagonalized for n ranging from 3 to 6. Is is also possible in these cases to find a range of parameters b in which $|W_n\rangle$ is the *nondegenerate ground state*. These ranges are reported in Table 3.1. Numerical

Table 1. Relevant properties of $|W_n\rangle$ (11) as an eigenstate of $H(b)$, defined in (12). In the third column, the range in which it is the ground state is indicated. $|W_n\rangle$ is degenerate at the extrema and nondengenerate inside the intervals.

n	Eigenvalue of $\|W_n\rangle$	Range for $\|W_n\rangle$ ground state
3	$-4+b$	$-2 \leq b \leq 0$
4	$-4+2b$	$-2 \leq b \leq -2(\sqrt{2}-1)$
5	$-4+3b$	$-2 \leq b \leq -(\sqrt{5}-1)$
6	$-4+4b$	$-2 \leq b \leq -2(\sqrt{3}-1)$

evidence shows that $|W_n\rangle$ ceases to be a nondegenerate ground state for $n \geq 7$. This, of course, does not mean that it would not be possible to find Hamiltonians which are more suitably tailored (and perhaps more complicated) than (12), and satisfy this property even for $n > 6$.

4. Local Hamiltonians with MMES eigenstates

In this section, we will study how is it possible to obtain MMES eigenstates of two-body Hamiltonians in the cases of $n = 3, 4, 5$ qubits. The focus will be mainly on the features of special Hamiltonians, since a discussion on the most general operators with MMES eigenstates is given in Ref. 22.

4.1. $n = 3$

In the case of three qubits, MMES are equivalent by single-qubit unitary operations to the GHZ state. Since the latter has a simple and symmetric form, let us choose to study its properties, with no significant loss of generality:

$$|M_3\rangle \equiv |G_+^3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|000\rangle + |111\rangle\right). \tag{16}$$

Since $\pi_A = 1/2$ for each bipartition, $|M_3\rangle$ saturates the lower bound in (4) and is therefore a perfect MMES. Moreover, the GHZ form of the state implies that it shares two-body reduced density matrices with its antisymmetric counterpart $|G_-^3\rangle$, meaning that it can never be the nondegenerate ground state of a two-body Hamiltonian.

The most general two-body Hamiltonian in the $n = 3$ case, which is *a fortiori* also nearest-neighbor, reads, apart from an irrelevant constant

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \left(\sum_{\alpha,\beta=x,y,z} \gamma_i^{\alpha\beta} \sigma_i^\alpha \sigma_{i+1}^\beta + \sum_{\alpha=x,y,z} h_i^\alpha \sigma_i^\alpha \right), \tag{17}$$

with the convention $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_4 \equiv \boldsymbol{\sigma}_1$. A first step consists in determining which conditions must hold on parameters γ and h to ensure that $|M_3\rangle$ is an eigenstate. It is possible to show[22] that the parameters in (17) have to meet for all i's the following requirements:

$$\begin{gathered} \gamma_{i+1}^{xx} - \gamma_{i+1}^{yy} = h_i^x, \qquad \gamma_{i+1}^{xy} + \gamma_{i+1}^{yx} = h_i^y, \\ \gamma_{i+1}^{yz} + \gamma_i^{zy} = 0, \qquad \gamma_{i+1}^{xz} + \gamma_i^{zx} = 0, \\ \sum_{i=1}^{3} h_i^z = 0. \end{gathered} \tag{18}$$

While conditions (18) ensure that $|M_3\rangle$ is an eigenstate of the Hamiltonian, it is not generally possible to analytically verify its nodegeneracy. Moreover, even when the above conditions are satisfied, H still contains non-parallel couplings, such as $\sigma^x\sigma^y$, which can be difficult to engineer and are not even necessary to avoid degeneracy. In order to simplify the picture, let us choose to study a simple operator, meeting all the requirements in Eq. (18) and depending on two parameters:

$$H_3(J,k) = J \sum_{i=1}^{3} \sigma_i^z \sigma_{i+1}^z + k \sum_{i=1}^{3} \left(\sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x - \sigma_i^x \right). \tag{19}$$

This Hamiltonian involves Ising-like couplings along the x and z axes with independent and general coupling constants, and an interaction with an external field along x, which is finely tuned with the Ising coupling in the same direction. It is evident that conditions (18) are satisfied. The operator $H_3(J,k)$ can be analytically diagonalized. The J-term gives $|M_3\rangle$ a nonzero eigenvalue

$$H_3(J,k)|M_3\rangle = 3J|M_3\rangle, \tag{20}$$

and avoids degeneracy with states having non aligned spins, such as $|001\rangle$ and $|110\rangle$, while the k-term removes the degeneracy with the GHZ state $(|000\rangle - |111\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, preserving the eigenstate property of $|M_3\rangle$. The spectrum as a function of J/k is plotted in Figure 1.

If $k \neq 0$, the MMES eigenstate has only two degeneracy points in $J = 0$ and $J = -k/2$, while it is always at least twofold degenerate when $k = 0$. An analysis of the spectrum in Figure 1 confirms that $|M_3\rangle$ can never be the nondegenerate ground state of the system. However, it is possible to identify ranges in which it is the *nondegenerate first-excited state*. These are

$$J/k < 1/2 \quad \text{for} \quad k > 0 \tag{21}$$



Fig. 1. Spectrum of the Hamiltonian $H_3(J,k)$ in Eq. (19) as a function of the reduced parameter J/k. The solid (red) line represents the eigenvalue $3J$ associated to the eigenstate $|M_3\rangle$, while dashed lines are the other energy levels. Notice that the eigenvalue $-(J+2k)$ is twofold degenerate and the eigenvalue $-J$ is threefold degenerate.

and

$$J > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad k < 0. \tag{22}$$

In this case, a tentative protocol to generate the MMES state would be to let the system relax towards the ground state, and then drive it to the lowest excited level.

4.2. $n = 4$

It is known that in the case of four qubits, perfect MMES satisfying $\pi_{\mathrm{ME}} = 1/2^2 = 1/4$ do not exist.[25,26,15] There is a proof[27] that the minimum of potential of multipartite entanglement is instead $\pi_{\mathrm{ME}} = 1/3$. In this section, we will analyze the properties of one of the minimizers,

$$|M_4\rangle = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\ell=0}^{15} \zeta_\ell^{(4)} |\ell\rangle, \tag{23}$$

where $\{|\ell\rangle\}_{0\le\ell\le 15} = \{|0000\rangle, |0001\rangle, \ldots, |1111\rangle\}$ are the states of the computational basis and

$$\zeta^{(4)} = \{1,1,1,1,1,1,-1,-1,1,-1,1,-1,-1,1,1,-1\} \tag{24}$$

is the array of coefficients. It is one of the so-called uniform real MMES, enumerated in Ref. 24, whose coefficients are all real and equal in modulus. While $|M_4\rangle$ is maximally mixed with respect to the bipartitions $(\{1,2\},\{3,4\})$ and $(\{1,3\},\{2,4\})$, the purity of the bipartition $(\{1,4\},\{2,3\})$ reads $\pi_{\{1,4\}} = 1/2 > 1/4$.

For $n = 4$, it has been found in Ref. 22 that there exist 24 independent and non-trivial elementary Hamiltonians with $|M_4\rangle$ as an eigenstate, which are two-body and

nearest neighbor. Most of them involve non parallel couplings, like $\sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^z$, which we manage to avoid in building the Hamiltonian $H_3(J,k)$ in the case $n=3$. On the contrary, in the four-qubit case it is necessary to include this type of interactions, since it is impossible for $|M_4\rangle$ to be a nondegenerate eigestate if only parallel couplings and interactions with external fields are present. One of the simplest Hamiltonian which for which $|M_4\rangle$ is a generally nondegenerate eigenstate reads

$$H_4(J,k) = J(\sigma_4^x\sigma_1^z + \sigma_3^x\sigma_2^z) + k\left(\sigma_1^x\sigma_4^z + \sigma_2^x\sigma_3^z + \sigma_2^x\sigma_1^z + \sigma_1^x\sigma_2^z - \sum_{i=1}^{4}\sigma_i^z\right). \quad (25)$$

Notice that also an external field along the z axis, finely tuned to the two-body interaction terms, is present. As for H_3 in (19), the parameter J determines the eigenvalue of the MMES, through

$$H_4(J,k)|M_4\rangle = 2J|M_4\rangle, \quad (26)$$

while terms multiplying the parameter k remove a fourfold degeneracy, related to the fact that there exist three states, which are orthogonal to $|M_4\rangle$ and to each other, and have the same expectation value $2J$ of the energy (see discussion in Section 3). Incidentally, the Hamiltonian we are considering has also a second MMES eigenstate. This is due to the fact that a reflection of the z axis maps $H_4(J,k)$ onto $-H_4(J,k)$, which has the same eigenstates with opposite eigenvalues. Thus, the state

$$|\tilde{M}_4\rangle = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\ell=0}^{15}\zeta^{(4)}_{15-\ell}|\ell\rangle \quad (27)$$

with $\zeta^{(4)}$ defined after Eq. (23), which is obtained by reflecting $|M_4\rangle$ with respect to the z axis, is also an eigenstate of H_4, with eigenvalue $-2J$.

The spectrum of H_4 as a function of the reduced parameter J/k is represented in Figure 2. Apart from the case $k=0$, in which the MMES eigenstate is systematically degenerate, it can be observed from Figure 2 that $|M_4\rangle$ has five degeneracy points on the J/k line, placed at

$$\frac{J}{k} = 0, \quad \frac{J}{k} = \pm\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad \frac{J}{k} = \pm\sqrt{3}. \quad (28)$$

It also emerges that the lowest possible level for the chosen MMES eigenstate is the second-excited one, which is occupied by $|M_4\rangle$ if

$$k > 0 \text{ and } J/k < -\sqrt{3/2} \qquad \text{or} \qquad k < 0 \text{ and } J/k > \sqrt{3/2}. \quad (29)$$

The impossibility to reach even the first excited state in the case of $|M_4\rangle$ is closely related to the energetic competition with (linearly independent) states having the same expectation value of H_4, which are in this case three, while in the $n=3$ case it was only one.



Fig. 2. Spectrum of the Hamiltonian $H_4(J,k)$ as a function of J/k. The solid (red) positive-slope line represents the eigenvalue $E = 2J$ of $|M_4\rangle$, while the solid (green) negative-slope line corresponds to the eigenvalue $E = -2J$ of the MMES state $|\tilde{M}_4\rangle$ [see Eq. (27) and discussion.] The dashed (blue) lines represent the other energy levels, with the zero eigenvalue being fourfold degenerate.

4.3. $n = 5$

Perfect MMES do exist for a system of five qubits. Let us consider as in the case $n = 4$ an example of a uniform and real MMES, namely

$$|M_5\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{31} \zeta_\ell^{(5)} |\ell\rangle, \tag{30}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta^{(5)} = \{&1,1,1,1,1,-1,-1,1,1,-1,-1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,\\ &-1,-1,1,\ -1,1,-1,-1,1,-1,1,-1,-1,1,1\}. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

The difficulty in finding a Hamiltonian with a MMES eigenstate evidently increase as one tackles the case $n = 5$. Indeed, even if the dimension of the Hilbert space is twice that of the previous case, the number of nontrivial elementary terms with $|M_5\rangle$ as an eigenstate remains 24, as in the case $n = 4$. It is even a harder task to avoid degeneracy and to find Hamiltonians with the energy of $|M_5\rangle$ close to the minimum[22]. The reason of such a difficulty lies in the fact that, in this case, there exist 31 states, all orthogonal to $|M_5\rangle$ and to each other, sharing the same expectation value for *all* two-body operators.

An example of Hamiltonian with a generally nondegenerate MMES eigenstate,

which can be at least numerically diagonalized, reads

$$H_5(J,k) = J\,(\sigma_1^x\sigma_2^x + \sigma_2^x\sigma_3^x + \sigma_4^x\sigma_5^x + \sigma_5^x\sigma_1^x + \sigma_3^y\sigma_4^y - \sigma_3^z\sigma_4^z - 2\sigma_1^z) + k\,(\sigma_1^y\sigma_2^y + \sigma_2^y\sigma_3^y + \sigma_4^y\sigma_5^y + \sigma_2^z\sigma_3^z + \sigma_4^z\sigma_5^z + \sigma_2^x - \sigma_3^x + \sigma_4^x - \sigma_5^x - \sigma_5^z)\,. \tag{32}$$

The eigenstate $|M_5\rangle$ has vanishing eigenvalue. Degeneracy occurs for

$$k = 0, \quad J = 0, \quad \frac{J}{k} \simeq \pm 0.24, \pm 0.54, \pm 1.35. \tag{33}$$

Since H_5 has roughly the same number of positive and negative eigenvalues, the eigenstate $|M_5\rangle$ is forced to stay at the center of the energy band. The best one can do in lowering its energy is to choose J/k in the open intervals $(0.24, 0.54)$ if $k > 0$ or $(-0.54, -0.24)$ if $k < 0$. In these cases, $|M_5\rangle$ is the thirteenth excited state.

5. (Rather non)local Hamiltonians with GHZ eigenstates

Let us recall the definition (6) of Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger states for a system of n qubits:

$$|G_\pm^n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|0\rangle^{\otimes n} \pm |1\rangle^{\otimes n}\right).$$

The great homogeneity of GHZ states as n varies, both in their definition and in their entanglement properties, suggests that the results obtained for the $n = 3$ MMES $|M_3\rangle = |G_+^3\rangle$ admit some generalization to an arbitrary number of qubits. Indeed, general results were obtained in Ref. 23, where necessary and sufficient conditions are discussed for a GHZ nondegenerate eigenstate of a Hamiltonian with k-body couplings, with $k < n$.

Here, we shall simply mention the main result: *if a Hamiltonian does not involve terms coupling at least* $[(n+1)/2]$ *qubits, then the GHZ state* $|G_+^n\rangle$ *cannot be a nondegenerate eigenstate.* The same result holds true for $|G_-^n\rangle$ and all the states obtained by applying local unitary transformations to $|G_+^n\rangle$. This limitation is frustrating for the task we are trying to accomplish, since it implies, for example, that for $n = 5$ and $n = 6$ three-body interactions are *necessary* to avoid the degeneracy of a GHZ eigenstate. Anyway, one can try to build Hamiltonians which are as local as possible, compatibly with the above negative result, namely which contain no more than $[(n+1)/2]$-body interaction terms.

The states $|G_+^n\rangle$ and $|G_-^n\rangle$ in (6) are twofold degenerate ground states of an Ising ferromagnetic Hamiltonian, acting on the n qubits on a circle:

$$H_0 = -\sum_{j=1}^{n} \sigma_j^z\sigma_{j+1}^z \quad (\text{with } \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{n+1} \equiv \boldsymbol{\sigma}_1). \tag{34}$$

In order to lift the degeneracy of the ground state, a suitable perturbation should be added to H_0, in a way to preserve the eigenstate property of $|G_+^n\rangle$. The "minimal"

perturbation consists in two terms, with a proper relative sign, flipping complementary sets of spins. In order to keep the range of coupling as small as possible, one can choose terms which flip $[n/2]$ and $n-[n/2]$ spins. If one uses σ^x matrices to flip spins, a suitable Hamiltonian reads

$$H(\lambda) = H_0 + \lambda H_1, \tag{35}$$

with

$$H_1 = \sigma_1^x \sigma_2^x \dots \sigma_{[n/2]}^x - \sigma_{[n/2]+1}^x \dots \sigma_n^x. \tag{36}$$

The relative minus sign ensures that $|G_+^n\rangle$ is an eigenstate for all λ, being

$$H_1 |G_+^n\rangle = 0. \tag{37}$$

On the other hand, H_1 couples $|G_-^n\rangle$ to another linear combination of two states with opposite spins, namely

$$|\tilde{G}_-^n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|0_1 \dots 0_{[n/2]} 1_{[n/2]+1} \dots 1_n\rangle - |1_1 \dots 1_{[n/2]} 0_{[n/2]+1} \dots 0_n\rangle \right). \tag{38}$$

The states $|G_-^n\rangle$ and $|\tilde{G}_-^n\rangle$ span a two-dimensional invariant sector of H_1. More generally, all the states which are superpositions with zero relative phase of two vectors of the computational basis with opposite spins are eigenstates of $H(\lambda)$, while superpositions with relative phase π are coupled in two-dimensional sectors.

Diagonalization for arbitrary n is performed in Ref. 23. In Figure 3, the full spectrum is plotted for the relevant case $n = 4$, which is the largest system in which a two-body perturbation is sufficient to remove degeneracy. The ground state of the system is a linear combination of $|G_-^n\rangle$ and $|\tilde{G}_-^n\rangle$, with energy

$$E_0 = -n - 2\left(\sqrt{1+\lambda^2} - 1\right). \tag{39}$$

This implies that $|G_+^n\rangle$, whose energy is $-n$, can be at most the first-excited state, as expected. Indeed, it is the nondegenerate first-excited state in the ranges $-2 < \lambda < 0$ and $0 < \lambda < 2$. Accidental degeneracies for the eigenstate $|G_+^n\rangle$ occur for

$$\lambda = \pm 2k \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lambda = \pm 2\sqrt{k(k+1)} \tag{40}$$

with $k = 0, 1, \dots, [n/2]$, including the case in which it is a degenerate ground state for $\lambda = 0$. These results show that, even if it is necessary to include (generally) nonlocal terms in the Hamiltonian to lift the degeneracy between $|G_+^n\rangle$ and $|G_-^n\rangle$, it is indeed sufficient to add a *small* nonlocal perturbation λH_1, with $\lambda \ll 1$, to obtain $|G_+^n\rangle$ as a nondegenerate first-excited state.

6. Conclusions and outlook

We have reviewed results on the possibility to obtain n-qubit MMES (for $n \leq 5$) and GHZ states as eigenstates of Hamiltonians involving only local interaction terms, and analyzed the properties of case-study Hamiltonians with multipartite-entangled



Fig. 3. Energy levels of $H(\lambda)$ for $n = 4$. The solid (red) line represents the constant energy of the eigenstate $|G^n_+\rangle$. The dashed (blue) lines correspond to other energy levels, some of which are degenerate. Notice the crossings between the GHZ energy and excited levels at $\lambda = 2$ and $\lambda = 2\sqrt{2}$, and the degeneracy with the ground state energy level at $\lambda = 0$. Eigenvalues are even functions of λ.

eigenstates. Since both MMES and GHZ states exhibit very distributed non-local correlations, the answer to this problem is nontrivial. Indeed, we found that these states can never be nondegenerate ground states of local Hamiltonians for $n > 2$. We also showed that this limitation does not arise in the case of W states. In the Hamiltonians we study throughout the paper, we find that, already for $n = 3$, MMES can at most be the first non-degenerate excited state, and the situation worsens as n increases. We find severe limitations on the possibility to find a few-body Hamiltonian with a GHZ nondegenerate eigenstate. All these results can be interpreted as a manifestation of entanglement frustration.[10,28,12]

Besides the foundational interest, research on the possibility to encode a multipartite-entangled state into the eigenstate of a local Hamiltonian is also motivated by few-qubit applications. Practically realizable quantum tasks usually involve only a very small number of qubits (see e.g. Ref. 32.) The most advanced quantum applications require that the qubits be prepared in highly entangled states with large fidelity. One expects that more performing applications would become possible by making use of MMES: some examples were proposed in Refs. 14 and 31. This clearly requires efficient methods to prepare MMES with large yield and efficiency. For example, if a MMES were the ground state of some Hamiltonian H, then one could engineer it by constructing H and letting the system relax toward its ground state. However, since this is not the case, one must consider a partial relaxation combined with control techniques or devise alternative strategies. Another possible mechanism for generating MMES is dynamical rather than static. This is obviously related to the degree of complexity of a quantum circuit that generates

MMES using, for instance, two-qubit gates. An interesting matter of investigation would be to analyze and compare the efficiency and reliability of the two strategies.

It would also be interesting to study the entangling power of the Hamiltonians with MMES and GHZ eigenstates,[33,9,34]. The performance in entangling an initial state (e.g. a factorized one) can be compared with the ones of standard Hamiltonians such as Ising- or Heisenberg-type, or local Hamiltonians with randomly distributed parameters. Future work will be devoted to this topic.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Paolo Facchi, Giuseppe Florio and Saverio Pascazio for fruitful interaction in the research on this topic and for useful suggestions on the present paper.

References

1. W. K. Wootters, *Quantum Inf. Comp.* **1** (2001) 27.
2. L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh and V. Vedral, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80** (2008) 517.
3. R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki and K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81** (2009) 865.
4. V. Coffman, J. Kundu and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* **61** (2000) 052306.
5. A. Wong and N. Christensen, *Phys. Rev. A* **63** (2001) 044301.
6. D. Bruss, *J. Math. Phys.* **43** (2002) 4237.
7. D. A. Meyer and N. R. Wallach, *J. Math. Phys.* **43** (2002) 4273.
8. M. Jakob and J. Bergou, *Phys. Rev. A* **76** (2007) 052107.
9. A.J. Scott, *Phys. Rev. A* **69** (2004) 052330.
10. C.M. Dawson and M.A. Nielsen, *Phys. Rev. A* **69** (2004) 052316.
11. C. Mejia-Monasterio, G. Benenti, G.G. Carlo and G. Casati, *Phys. Rev. A* **71** (2005) 062324.
12. P. Facchi, G. Florio, U. Marzolino, G. Parisi and S. Pascazio, *New J. Phys.* **12** (2010) 025015.
13. U. Marzolino, S.M. Giampaolo and F. Illuminati, *Phys. Rev. A* **88** (2013) 020301(R).
14. J. Zhang, G. Adesso, C. Xie and K. Peng, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103** (2009) 070501.
15. P. Facchi, G. Florio, G. Parisi and S. Pascazio, *Phys. Rev. A* **77** (2008) 060304(R).
16. D.M. Greenberger, M.A. Horne and A. Zeilinger, in *Bells Theorem, Quantum Theory, and Conceptions of the Universe*, ed. M. Kafatos (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1989), pp. 69-72.
17. W. Dür, G. Vidal and J.I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. A* **62** (2000) 062314.
18. P. Stelmachovic and V. Buzek, *Phys. Rev. A* **70** (2004) 032313.
19. B. Rothlisberger, J. Lehmann, D. S. Saraga, P. Traber and D. Loss, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** (2008) 100502.
20. B. Rothlisberger, J. Lehmann and D. Loss, *Phys. Rev. A* **80** (2009) 042301.
21. S.M. Giampaolo, F. Illuminati, P. Verrucchi and S. De Siena, *Phys. Rev. A* **77** (2008) 012319.
22. P. Facchi, G. Florio, S. Pascazio and F. Pepe, *Phys. Rev. A* **82** (2010) 042313.
23. P. Facchi, G. Florio, S. Pascazio, and F.V. Pepe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** (2011) 260502.
24. P. Facchi, *Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.* **20** (2009) 25.
25. A. Higuchi and A. Sudbery, *Phys. Lett. A* **273** (2000) 213.
26. S. Brierley and A. Higuchi, *J. Phys. A* **40** (2007) 8455.

27. G. Gour and N.R. Wallach, *J. Math. Phys.* **51** (2010) 112201.
28. H.L. Haselgrove, M.A. Nielsen and T.J. Osborne, *Phys. Rev. A* **69** (2004) 032303.
29. M. Van den Nest, K. Luttmer, W. Dür and H.J. Briegel, *Phys. Rev. A* **77** (2008) 012301.
30. T.J. Osborne and F. Verstraete, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96** (2006) 220503.
31. P. Facchi, G. Florio, C. Lupo, S. Mancini and S. Pascazio, *Phys. Rev. A* **80** (2009) 062311.
32. J.T. Barreiro, M. Müller, P. Schindler, D. Nigg, T. Monz, M. Chwalla, M. Hennrich, C.F. Roos, P. Zoller and R. Blatt, *Nature* **470** (2011) 486.
33. P. Zanardi, C. Zalka and L. Faoro, *Phys. Rev. A* **62** (2000) 030301.
34. A.J. Scott and C.M. Caves. *J. Phys. A* **36** (2003) 9553.